

# CITY OF SAN BRUNO



567 El Camino Real  
San Bruno, CA 94066  
Voice: (650) 616-7074  
Fax: (650) 873-6749  
<http://www.ci.sanbruno.ca.us>

## **STAFF**

Tambri Heyden, AICP, *Community Development Director*  
Aaron Aknin, AICP, *Planning Manager*  
Mark Sullivan, AICP, *Housing and Redevelopment Manager*  
Beilin Yu, *Associate Planner*  
Tony Rozzi, *Assistant Planner*  
Lisa Costa-Sanders, *Contract Planner*  
Cathy Hidalgo, *Recording Secretary*  
Pamela Thompson, *City Attorney*

## **PLANNING**

### **COMMISSIONERS**

Sujendra Mishra, *Chair*  
Rick Biasotti, *Vice-Chair*  
*Commissioners:*  
Mary Lou Johnson  
Bob Marshall Jr.  
Perry Petersen  
Kevin Chase  
Joe Sammut

## **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**March 21, 2006**

San Bruno Senior Center  
1555 Crystal Springs Blvd.  
7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M.

**CALL TO ORDER at 7:00 pm.**

### **ROLL CALL**

	<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
Chair Mishra	X	
Vice Chair Biasotti	X	
Commissioner Chase	X	
Commissioner Johnson	X	
Commissioner Marshall		X
Commissioner Petersen	X	
Commissioner Sammut		X

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Planning Division: Community Development Director: Tambri Heyden  
Planning Manager: Aaron Aknin  
Associate Planner: Beilin Yu  
Assistant Planner: Tony Rozzi

Pledge of Allegiance: Assistant Planner Tony Rozzi

### **1. Approval of Minutes – February 21, 2006**

**Motion to Approve Minutes of February 21, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.**

**Commissioners Johnson/Biasotti**

VOTE: 5-0  
AYES: All Commissioners Present  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:

**2. Communication**

None at this time.

**3. Public Comment**

None at this time.

**4. Announcement of Conflict of Interest**

None

**5. 849 Second Avenue**

**Request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of a new residence which exceeds the 44% Lot Coverage and the .55 Floor Area Ratio guideline and a Parking Exception to allow tandem parking, per Sections 12.200.030.A.1, 12.200.030.A.2, and 12.200.080.C of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Rommel Mendez (Applicant); Sunil Chand (Owner). UP-05-68, PE-05-11**

*Associate Planner Yu* entered staff report, and explained that the neighbor at the rear of the property contacted staff and was concerned regarding the location of the rear property line since a fence does not exist. Requested that the planning Commission add an additional condition of approval to require the applicant to survey the rear property line to insure that the construction of the new residence will be located 10 feet away from the rear property line as required by the zoning code.

*Chair Mishra* asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

*Applicant:* Applicant, Rommel Mendez, designer of project. The project is small and everything is straightforward. Discussed the conditions of approval with the applicant and he is representing them.

*Chair Mishra* asked Commission if there were any questions for applicant.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Stated she visited the property and there is no doubt that this home needs an expansion. The expansion is warranted. Questioned what the blue tarp covering in the rear of the property was?

*Applicant:* Responded that he didn't know.

*Associate Planner Yu:* Clarified that it was storage and would be removed as part of the proposed project, since part of the addition will occupy that part of the property. Nothing permanent.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Asked applicant to clarify the use of some metal buildings in the rear of the property which she was unable to identify.

*Applicant:* Responded that he and owner have not make contact with property owner on that side, believes it is corrugated metal, roofing material.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Stated that they are buildings.

*Applicant:* Responded that he was unsure if it was a building. He believes it to be about 2 stories high.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Agreed with applicant. Whether they are buildings or storage, it looks like they are being used. Interested in knowing what is back there, if the material is combustible, time to take a look at it.

*Applicant:* Questioned commissioner if she was speaking of the neighbors or the applicant.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Clarified directly behind the property and also the property to the south, there is an identical building side by side.

*Applicant:* Will check with owner.

*Planning Manager Akin:* Mentioned that there was no fence in the rear property and could be viewing the auto body shop in back. Because there is no fence dividing the property it's hard to determine the property line. It's probably the buildings in back, which are on the 800 block of San Mateo Avenue. This could be part of the confusion- it is a mixed zone but is all commercial on that side of the lots. Most of the uses on that side are auto body.

*Chair Mishra:* Regarding comment from a neighbor, asked staff to address.

*Associate Planner Yu:* Addressed that neighbor to the rear of the property, since there is no fence, there was question as to where the rear property line was, so staff addressed the Planning Commission to condition that a survey be done in order to make sure that the building that is being constructed meets the 10' setback.

*Applicant:* Agreed.

*Chair Mishra:* To applicant, how did you determine where the property line was?

*Applicant:* Responded that the property line was measured based on the assessor's map and length from back of sidewalk.

*Commissioner Petersen:* Comments that the floor plan shows the stairs in back but is not shown on the elevations. Questions the reason for that. Sheet 2, floor plan, shows the steps. Sheet 3, which is the elevation, the left side and the right side elevation do not show any stairs in back. Are they going to put stairs there or not?

*Applicant:* Apologized for the mistake. They are going to put it there.

*Commissioner Petersen:* Explained that measuring the lot dimensions from the rear of the sidewalk is usually inaccurate. Advocates for a survey requirement.

*Applicant:* Question to the commission, with the correct property line and the 10-foot setback, *can* a storage shed be set within the setback requirements.

*Planning Manager Akin:* Explained that there are 2 different setback requirements. Assuming that you have a non-combustible shed, you cannot have that one, without knowing what your lot coverage is to see if it is close to the lot coverage and how much square footage you can have there. A 10x12 shed can be there without pulling a permit but it has to be set back 1 foot from the rear property line, side property line and 6 feet away from the house.

*Commissioner Biasotti:* Question to staff, what if they don't meet setback after survey

*Planning Manager Akin:* Responded that they would have to revise the plans to meet the setback requirement.

*Commissioner Biasotti:* Questioned if it would have to come back to Architectural review.

*Planning Manager Akin:* Responded, not unless Planning Commission wanted it to. If it's not going to effect overall arch and it is actually less square footage than what they proposed before, it can be done at the staff level.

*Commissioner Petersen:* Questioned if the stairs qualified as a structure for the 10-foot setback.

*Planning Manager Akin:* Responded that open staircases can encroach up to 6 feet into a required rear setback.

Public Comment opened.

Wayne Parker, 840 San Mateo Avenue: wanted to support the need for a surveyor. He is the property owner immediately behind and it is an auto repair facility

Public Comment closed.

*Chair Mishra* asked Commission if there was any discussion.

**Motion to approve Use Permit 05-68 and Parking Exception 05-11, based on Findings of Fact (1-8) and Conditions of Approval (1-15) to include the request for a surveyor.**

**Commissioner Johnson/Chase**

VOTE: 5-0  
AYES: All Commissioners Present  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:

## **FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**

1. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
2. The general appearance of the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design, scale and materials will match the materials found in the immediate neighborhood and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
3. Because the proposed addition meets all minimum setback requirements per the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance, and the second story will not extend the entire length of the residence, the proposal will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the

appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.

4. The construction of the addition is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for single-family residential purposes.
5. The off-street parking is adequate for the proposed residence.
6. The strict application of the provisions of this chapter (San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.100) would cause particular difficulty or undue hardship in connection with the use and enjoyment of said property since the lot is too narrow to accommodate two side-by-side parking spaces and the two car tandem is consistent with the other two garage spaces found in the immediate neighborhood.
7. The establishment, maintenance and/or conducting of the off street parking facilities as proposed are as nearly in compliance with the requirements set forth in this chapter (San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.100) as are reasonably possible with tandem parking.
8. Property is in the San Bruno Redevelopment Area and the proposed improvements are consistent with the San Bruno Redevelopment Plan.

#### **CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL**

Community Development Department – (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-68 and Parking Exception 05-11 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 05-68 and Parking Exception 05-11 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit and Parking Exception for a new residence shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on March 21, 2006, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100

feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The residence shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.
8. The entire residence shall be finished with stucco.

**Department of Public Works – (650) 616-7065**

9. Encroachment Permit from Engineering Department required prior to work. S.B.M.C. 8.16.010.
10. No fence, retaining wall, or other permanent structure to be placed within 2' from back of sidewalk. S.B.M.C. 8.08.010.
11. Install a sanitary sewer lateral clean-out at property line per City standards detail SS-01.
12. Paint address number on face of curb near driveway approach. Black lettering on white background.
13. Storm water from new and existing roof down-spouts and other on-site drainage, shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through an under sidewalk curb drain to the gutter per City standards detail SI-03. Chapter 11, UPC 1101.1.
14. Planting of one (1) 36-inch box size approved tree or payment of \$540.00 each to the in-lieu replacement tree fund. S.B.M.C. 8.24.060

**Planning Commission – (650) 616-7074**

15. A land survey of record must be attained prior to Building Division submittal. Property lines shall be verified and proposed plans revised if necessary. Planning Division staff shall have the right to approve or request Architectural Review if necessary.

**Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.**

## 6. 483 Walnut Avenue

Request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of an addition which increases the gross floor area by more than 50%, exceeds the .55 floor area ratio guideline, and exceeds the 44% lot coverage guideline per Sections 12.200.030.B.1, 12.200.030.B.2, and 12.200.030.B.3 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Jose Casco (Applicant); Viliami and Mele Finau (Owners). **UP-05-72**

*Associate Planner Yu* entered staff report.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Use Permit 05-72 based on Findings of Fact (1-6) and Conditions of Approval (1-17).

*Chair Mishra* asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Asked for clarification on the windows needing to be rectangular?

*Associate Planner Yu:* Responded that it is on right side elevation, sheet A1 and front elevation, sheet A3, 2 windows on the second story that are proposed arch tops. Staff is requesting they are rectangular to match the rest of the home's windows.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Commented that even though the applicant felt that it was a design for them, staff doesn't feel it is within the integrity of the building. This is the first time this type of recommendation has been made.

*Planning Manager Akin:* Explained that this was in response to some of the Architect Review committee comments and some of the comments that have come about in past Planning Commission meetings regarding window consistencies. Ultimately it is up to the Planning Commission on what to do and this is just a staff recommendation.

*Commissioner Chase:* Was on ARC for this. Wasn't concerned with the arch window so much as it was the grid/non grid treatment. In this case, he doesn't think staff's recommendation is valid; it wouldn't do justice to the project.

*Chair Mishra:* Requested that this discussion be moved to the discussion section.

*Chair Mishra* asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

*Applicant:* Applicant, Jose Casco, designer. Comments that they are going to keep to the existing colors of the home - presented to the PC. Regarding the window design, didn't remember the arch design as being thoroughly discussed. Interior is a cathedral design and the windows should complement it. On the right side elevation, part of the ceiling in that room is cathedral ceiling and the window compliments that design.

*Commissioner Chase:* Regarding the color palette: unclear as to which one is being proposed. Situation clarified- he had the wrong one in his hand.

*Commissioner Johnson:* In the report it was answered that they were going to tear down the accessory structure. Is it currently being used as habitable space?

*Applicant* Explained that it is being used for storage and will be returned to original garage. The carport will be removed as part of staff recommendations even though they do not want to do it.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Commented that the property is very tidy and neat. On her visit there, she learned that the parents live in the garage and it is not being used for storage. For the record it is habitable space and it is critically important that that it is going to be a garage.

*Planning Manager Akin:* We searched the records and there was no permit for the carport. 25 years ago, it would not have been allowed in that location. Needs to be removed.

*Commissioner Petersen:* Question to Applicant. Would they like to keep a carport of some size in the area if possible? You may have to tear it down and rebuild it. If it doesn't meet code it may be very hard to make it meet code without rebuilding it.

*Applicant:* If its possible to place the garage door back on it and clean up the area, yes they would want it kept, but not tear it down.

*Commissioner Petersen.* To Staff, is it the case that there has to be a 10 foot setback in order to have that carport without a variance?

*Planning Manager Akin:* Explained that it needs to be a 20' driveway leading up to the garage and not exceed lot coverage.

Public Comment opened.

Public Comment closed.

*Chair Mishra* asked Commission if there was any discussion.

*Commissioner Petersen:* Admired the Commission's discussion regarding windows and window treatments. Believes the current design complements the project. Also, does the garage require a man door as well as a garage door?

*Planning Manager Akin:* Unsure. There is no zoning regulation that requires the man door but would check with the Building Division.

*Commissioner Biasotti:* To the applicant. Thanks for agreeing to convert the garage back into a garage

**Motion to approve Use Permit 05-72 based on Findings of Fact (1-6) and Conditions of Approval (1-17).**

**Commissioner Petersen/Biasotti**

VOTE: 5-0  
AYES: All Commissioners Present  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:

**FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**

1. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.



2. The general appearance of the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design, scale and materials will match the materials found in the immediate neighborhood and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
3. Because the proposed addition meets all minimum setback requirements per the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance, the proposal will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
4. The construction of the addition is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for single-family residential purposes.
5. Reinstatement of the off-street parking complies with the City's zoning requirements.
6. Property is in the San Bruno Redevelopment Area and the proposed improvements are consistent with the San Bruno Redevelopment Plan.

#### **CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL**

##### **Community Development Department – (650) 616-7074**

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-72 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 05-72 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit for an addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on March 21, 2006, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The residence shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.
8. All windows on the proposed structure shall contain the same style and window treatment.

**Department of Public Works – (650) 616-7065**

9. Encroachment Permit from Engineering Department required prior to work. S.B.M.C. 8.16.010. There will be no fee, if the sidewalk around the premises is fixed.
10. No fence, retaining wall, or other permanent structure to be placed within 2' from back of sidewalk. S.B.M.C. 8.08.010.
11. Install a sanitary sewer lateral clean-out at property line per City standards detail SS-01.
12. Paint address number on face of curb near driveway approach. Black lettering on white background.
13. Storm water from new and existing roof down-spouts and other on-site drainage, shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through an under sidewalk curb drain to the gutter per City standards detail SI-03. Chapter 11, UPC 1101.1.
14. Planting of one (1) 36-inch box size approved tree or payment of \$540.00 each to the in-lieu replacement tree fund. S.B.M.C. 8.24.060

**Fire Department – (650) 616-7096**

15. Provide spark arrestors for chimney.
16. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
17. Provide hardwired smoke detector to all bedrooms and hallways.

**Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.**

## 7. **316 Elm Avenue**

Request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of an addition to an existing residence which exceeds the .55 floor area ratio and the 44% lot coverage guidelines per Section 12.200.030.B.2 and 12.200.030.B.3 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Gabriel F. Canaya (Applicant / Owner). UP-05-77

*Associate Planner Yu* entered staff report.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Use Permit 05-77 based on Findings of Fact (1-5) and Conditions of Approval (1-17).

*Chair Mishra* asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Commented that the addition was right on the property line and done without permits. What is the approach on this project?

*Associate Planner Yu:* Applicant is going to reduce the size of the addition to meet the required 5-foot setback. It is not going to remain as is.

*Chair Mishra* asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

*Applicant:* Giyould Canaya, owner. Thanked committee for the work so far. Has agreed to bring the addition back to meet the 5-foot side setbacks.

*Chair Mishra* asked Commission if there were any questions for applicant.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Regarding the downspouts, how will they be done for project?

*Applicant:* Answered that they will run through a ditch to the curb cut for drainage.

Public Comment opened.

Public Comment closed.

*Chair Mishra* asked Commission if there was any discussion.

*Chair Mishra:* To ARC; explain massiveness of the walls- were any bellybands suggested? What about the stairs and the awning? Did you discuss the windows and sliding doors?

*Commissioner Biasotti:* Responded that he recalled that all they were looking at was the reduction in size of the utility room and the rest of it is all existing structure.

*Commissioner Johnson:* Clarified as well. Also added that a neighbor was in support of the project.

**Motion to approve Use Permit 05-77 based on Findings of Fact (1-5) and Conditions of Approval (1-17).**

**Biasotti/Johnson**

VOTE: 5-0  
AYES: All Commissioners Present  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:

## **FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**

1. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
2. The general appearance of the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design, scale and materials will match the materials found in the immediate neighborhood and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
3. Because the proposed addition meets all minimum setback requirements per the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance, the proposal will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
4. The construction of the addition is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for single-family residential purposes.
5. The off-street parking complies with the City zoning requirements.

## **CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL**

### **Community Development Department – (650) 616-7074**

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-77 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 05-77 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit for an addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on March 21, 2006, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100

feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The residence shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.

#### **Department of Public Works – (650) 616-7065**

8. Encroachment Permit from Engineering Department required prior to work. S.B.M.C. 8.16.010.
9. No fence, retaining wall, or other permanent structure to be placed within 2' from back of sidewalk. S.B.M.C. 8.08.010.
10. Paint address number on face of curb near driveway approach. Black lettering on white background.
11. Replace all broken or raised concrete in sidewalk or driveway approach as marked. S.B.M.C. 8.12.010. Marking shall take place under Building Review.
12. Storm water from new and existing roof down-spouts and other on-site drainage, shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through an under sidewalk curb drain to the gutter per City standards detail SI-03. Chapter 11, UPC 1101.1. Drain to landscape allowed.
13. Removal of un-permitted undersidewalk curb drain, bubble-up or other over sidewalk drainage required. Replace with City standards undersidewalk curb drain, detail SI-03
14. Remove weeds and grass from sidewalk, curb and gutter. Prune other plantings in the right-of-way. S.B.M.C. 8.24.140/150/180.

#### **Fire Department – (650) 616-7096**

15. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
16. Provide spark arrestors for chimney.
17. Roofing material shall be non-combustible.

**Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.**

**8. 461 El Camino Real**

Request for a Parking Exception to allow a covered patio to the rear of an existing restaurant per Section 12.100.010.A of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Isaac Mejia (Applicant), Anstell Ricossa (Owner) PE-06-02

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission continue Parking Exception 06-02 to April 18, 2006 meeting.

**Motion to continue Parking Exception 06-002**

**Petersen/Chase**

VOTE: 5-0  
AYES: All Commissioners Present  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:

**Chair Mishra advised that the item is continued**

**9.City Staff Discussion**

*Planning Manager Akin:*

April 13, 2006 ARC Meeting volunteers. Volunteers: Commissioner Biasotti, Chair Mishra and staff will follow up with Commissioners Marshall and Sammut to see if they can attend.

Conflict of Interest Discussion- Will go to the next agenda; City Attorney not at tonight's meeting

Distribution of Zoning Code – Everyone has copy, first redone since 1999. Asked everyone to look at when ordinances were adopted.

*Commissioner Petersen:* Does this mean that the General Plan will be updated soon?

*Planning Manager Akin:* Last General Plan was adopted in 1984. Gave due time as July for updated General Plan.

**10.Planning Commission Discussion**

*Commissioner Johnson:* Out of country for 4/18/06 meeting

*Commissioner Biasotti:* Made annual report to City Council. Council Member Ibarra requested the Planning Commission come up with ideas to improve the City of San Bruno. Staff has suggested that we conduct a workshop, looking for ideas from the Planning Commission.

*Planning Manager Akin:* Comments that staff was interested in having some type of workshop to see what could improve the process for citizens and can we work on residential design guidelines? Any ideas to help the citizens through this process.

Commissioner Johnson: Questioned if there was a timeline.

Planning Manager Akin: Responded No.

*Chair Mishra:* Is this a yearly report that is done.

*Planning Manager Akin:* Responded it is similar to the Bike Pedestrian Committee yearly report. Summarizes the amount of use permits done, how many ARC did, what is the projection for 2006.

*Chair Mishra:* Can we add to next discussion for the agenda: take a month to come up with some ideas. Understands the recommendation for Study circles to discuss ideas in the presence of City Staff as well.

Commissioner Biasotti: Issues of code enforcement would be a useful topic. How can we make this process a little more user friendly? How about televising the ARC meetings.

*Commissioner Petersen:* was there some instruction planned for the PC in the future?

*Planning Manager Akin:* Not for improvement, directed to pc but to see what pc would like to do differently.

### **13.Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 7:53 pm

---

**Tambri Heyden**

Secretary to the Planning Commission  
City of San Bruno

---

**Sujendra Mishra, Chair**

Planning Commission  
City of San Bruno

**NEXT MEETING: April 18, 2006**

TH/ch